



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/285,899	04/08/99	YAMAZAKI	S 0756-1950

MM42/0630  
SIXBEY, FRIEDMAN, LEEDOM & FERGUSON  
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE, SUITE 800  
MCLEAN VA 22102

EXAMINER

DUDEK, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED:

06/30/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/285,899

Applicant(s)  
Yamazaki et al

Examiner  
James Dudek

Group Art Unit  
2871



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 5-8, 17-20, 29-32, and 41-44 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-16, 21-28, 33-40, and 45-48 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 08/857,957.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

After searching all the continuing applications, the Examiner was unable to locate the references not considered and is now asking the applicant to please forward a copy of each reference not considered.

### ***Specification***

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4, 9-16, 21-28, 33-40 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inaba et al (5,227,900) in view of Yamato et al (61-141174).

Art Unit:

Per claims 1-3 and 25-27, Inaba et al discloses the claimed invention except for the organic resin film leveling layer and the pixel electrode formed on top of the leveling layer. However, Yamato et al teach that the usual way of forming a TFT is by forming a leveling layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the leveling layer of Yamato et al with the ferroelectric display of Inaba et al since, as taught by Inaba et al, this was well known.

Per claims 9-11, 21-23, 33-35, and 45-47 Inaba et al discloses the claimed invention, as described above, except for the leveling layer formed on the second substrate. However, it was conventional to form a passivation layer (which would level the layer) on the second substrate to protect the color filters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a leveling layer on the second substrate in order to protect the color filters.

Per claims 13-15 and 21-23, Inaba et al discloses the claimed invention, as described above, except for the television tuner. However, it was conventional to add a tuner to an LCD in order to display television images. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a tuner to the display of Inaba et al in order to display television images.

Per claims 37-39 and 45-47, it was conventional to add a light and lens projector.

Per claims 4, 12, 16, 24, 28, 36, 40, and 48 Inaba et al discloses the claimed invention, as described above, except for the top gate structure. However, it was well known to substitute a top bottom gate TFT for a top gate TFT in the LCD art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute a top gate TFT for the bottom gate TFT of Inaba et al, since it was a well known substitution.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 5-8, 17-20, 29-32 and 41-44 are allowed.

Art Unit:

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to James Dudek at telephone number (703) 308-4093.

June 25, 1999

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James A. Dudek".

**James A. Dudek**  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 280